



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

fellowship of the souls of the righteous with God after death, and looked for a general balancing of accounts at the day of judgment. The climax of Hebrew thought upon immortality is presented in the Wisdom of Solomon; but Dr. Torge ends his study with the close of the Protestant Canon.

JOHN M. P. SMITH

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

BARTON'S COMMENTARY ON ECCLESIASTES

The reputation of the "International Critical Commentary Series" for a high grade of scholarship is such, that an announcement of the publication of a new volume is a matter of deep interest in Biblical circles. This interest is naturally intensified when the particular book presents problems of especial difficulty, such as Ecclesiastes, and the author is one from whom a thoroughgoing and judicious treatment of those problems may be expected. It is with pleasure, therefore, that to the number of excellent works on this puzzling book of the Old Testament already published in English—introductions, expositions and critical commentaries—by such scholars as McNeile, Wright, Plumptre, Genung, etc., this new volume by Professor Barton¹ is welcomed as one which sustains the high reputation of this admirable series.

Of the 212 pages of this commentary, 65 are devoted to introductory material; the remainder to the critical exposition of the text. The following are the topics treated in the introductory part of the book: the name; place in the Hebrew Canon; the versions; history of the interpretation; the relation of Ecclesiastes to Greek thought; the integrity of the book; the outline of the thought; its literary form; its linguistic characteristics; its relation to Ben-Sira (Ecclesiasticus); the attitude of the Book of Wisdom to Ecclesiastes; the date and authorship. As the most interesting questions, and those debatable in the book, come under discussion in these introductory topics this review will be occupied especially with the author's treatment of them and his conclusions.

In reference to canonicity Professor Barton agrees with Ryle² that it is unlikely that any new book would be introduced into the Hebrew Canon after the first century B. C. Hence Ecclesiastes, though one of the "Antilegomena" must have begun to gain a foothold in some influential quarter before that date (p. 6).

¹ *The Book of Ecclesiastes*. By Professor George Aaron Barton, Ph.D., Professor of Biblical Literature and Semitic Languages, Bryn Mawr College. "International Critical Commentary." New York: Scribners, 1908. 212 pages. \$2.25.

² Cf. his *Canon of the Old Testament*, 2d ed., p. 185.

As regards the LXX version of the book he adopts McNeile's view³ that it was not made till the end of the first century A. D., and that it was done by Aquila, a native of Pontus, who was first a convert to Christianity and then to Judaism.

The reasons for this view are that the version of Qoheleth, in the LXX, exhibits many of the most marked peculiarities of the style of Aquila's version as preserved by Origen in his famous Hexapla—peculiarities which occur to the same extent in the Septuagint version of no other Old Testament book (p. 9).

In the section on the history of interpretation an excellent summary and criticism is given of the views of leading scholars from the time of Luther to the present. The various interpretations may be conveniently grouped into two classes—one that the book is not a unity in its present form, the text being either disorganized (Bickell), or interpolated; the other that it is a unity, expressing in the contradictory statements (or expressions which at least do not harmonize with the main thought of the book), the varying moods of the writer (p. 22).

In criticizing Bickell's view, based on the assumption that the manuscript of Ecclesiastes existed in book form, the pages of which being accidentally dislocated, the present confused order of the text resulted, the author points out the fact that the roll form of manuscript continued in use till about 300 A. D. Thus from the archaeological standpoint the fundamental assumption of Bickell's theory is disproved (pp. 26 f.).

Between the two opposing views of interpolations and unity of authorship (e. g., Cornill and Genung), Professor Barton decides in favor of the former, though far from taking such extreme positions as those of Haupt and Siegfried—the latter for instance holding that there were five different hands at work in producing the present book, besides several others of an editorial character (p. 28). Professor Barton concludes that the original Ecclesiastes has passed through the hands of two editors. The first was an adherent of Wisdom literature, who added such Wisdom glosses as 4:5; 5:3, 7a (vss. 2, 6a, Hebr.); 7:1a, 3, 5, 6-9, 11, 12, 19; 8:1; 9:17, 18; 10:1-3, 8-14a, 15, 18, 19. The second editor inserted verses from the Chasid or Pharasaic standpoint to harmonize the thought of the book with the orthodox doctrine of his time. To this editor belong the title (1:1), the expressions, "saith Qoheleth" (1:2; 7:27, and 12:8), because the writer of the book generally speaks of himself in the first person (cf. 1:12; 2:1, etc.), and because these words interrupt the rhythm in 1:2 and 12:8, while in 7:27 they actually interrupt the discourse in the first person; also the verses 12:9-12, 13a (to the word "heard"). The follow-

³ Cf. his *Introduction to Ecclesiastes*, pp. 115-34.

ing verses are also from the same hand because they are contrary to the main thought of the book: (2:26; 3:17; 7:18*b*, 26*b*, 29; 8:2*b*, 3*a*, 5, 6*a*, 11-13; 11:9*b*; 12:1*a*, 13 (from the words, "fear God"), 14. Whether this classification of editorial additions commends itself to all scholars or not, it seems to the reviewer that Professor Barton's position, between the extremes of opinion, viz., unity of authorship and multiplicity of authors, is nearer the facts of the case. As he points out, the additions by these editors make "but a small part of the material in the book" (p. 46). Some scholars today (e. g., Cornill and Genung) would not admit even so limited a revision as this as compared with the positions of Haupt and Siegfried, but the *possibility* of editorial hands at work in Ecclesiastes cannot be denied when at present so many scholars believe that most of the prophetic writings, for instance, have passed through editorial revision; and especially when an adequate motive can be suggested for the insertion of harmonizing additions, as in the view adopted by Professor Barton.

The relation of Ecclesiastes to Greek thought is one of the interesting questions of the book. Here again the opinion of scholars differs as to whether there are traces of Stoic and Epicurean thought or not.

Professor Barton concludes with Renan and McNeile

that everything in Qoheleth can be accounted for as a development of Semitic thought, and that the expressions which have been seized upon to prove that its writer came under the influence of Greek schools of philosophy only prove at most that Qoheleth was a Jew who had in him the making of a Greek philosopher (p. 34).

Thus in 3:1-9, which Tyler for instance considers to reflect Stoic doctrine, especially that of inexorable fate, the author thinks that there is found simply a conception common to all writers of the period of Ecclesiastes (pp. 34 f.). Again he considers without adequate foundation the theory of Epicurean thought in 3:18-22 and 5:18-20, which Tyler advocates, the former passage according to this writer teaching the doctrine of the mortality of the soul and the latter the "doctrine of pleasure or tranquillity as the essential principle of life." As opposed to this view Professor Barton maintains that we have in the first the expression of a passing doubt, not a dogmatic statement; the second is a Semitic point of view older than Epicurus by several centuries (p. 38).

Contrary to the recent views of Zapletal and Haupt, who independently of each other came to the conclusion that the original form of Ecclesiastes was metrical, the author concludes with the great majority of scholars that it is a prose book. The metrical theory involves an entirely too drastic treatment of the text (pp. 50 f.).

As related to other writings he agrees with Wright, McNeile, etc., that the authors of Ecclesiasticus and the Book of Wisdom, both made use of Ecclesiastes—the former approving of its teachings, the latter disapproving of them. A full list of parallel passages between the writings is given showing the grounds on which this conclusion is reached (pp. 53-58).

With all modern scholars Professor Barton accepts the late date of Ecclesiastes. It will be needless to cite the arguments for this conclusion as they are well known. Between the Persian and Greek periods he decides in favor of the latter. More specifically he dates it about 198 B. C., in agreement with Hitzig, Tyler, Cornill, and Genung. This conclusion he reaches from 4:13-16, in which he refers the "old and foolish king" (vs. 13) to Ptolemy IV (Philopator), who died in 205 B. C. The "poor and wise youth" (vs. 13) is Ptolemy V (Epiphanes), who was only five years of age when he succeeded to the throne. The "second youth" (vs. 15, if the word "second" is genuine), is Antiochus III of Syria, who, within seven years after the succession of Ptolemy V, was welcomed as sovereign of Judea. These inferences he thinks are confirmed by 10:16, 17; vs. 16 referring to Ptolemy V and vs. 17 reflecting probably the author's welcome of the strong rule of Antiochus III. These inferences may be correct but it seems to the reviewer that they are uncertain. It was the view of the late Professor A. B. Davidson that all attempts at identification in the book are conjectural.⁴ But that the date of the book may be placed from 250 to 200 B. C. seems very probable.

It should be noted that an excellent outline of the thought of the book is given (pp. 46-50) which adds much to the value of the volume.

It remains to add that the commentary portion of the book is marked by thoroughness and judiciousness in the treatment of the text and exposition, and ranks with the best volumes of this series. This volume can be heartily commended to those desiring the latest and best commentary in English on this book.

HARLAN CREELMAN

AUBURN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
AUBURN, N. Y.

A HISTORY OF THE ANCIENT EGYPTIANS

For the very exacting task of writing a handbook on the history of the Ancient Egyptians¹ it would be hard to conceive finer or more complete

⁴ Cf. *Encyclopedia Biblica*, II, 1162.

¹ *A History of the Ancient Egyptians*. By James Henry Breasted, Ph.D., in the Historical Series for Bible Students, edited by Charles F. Kent, Ph.D., and Frank K. Sanders, Ph.D., Vol. V. New York: Scribners, 1908. xiv+469 pages. \$1.25.